UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/722,982	11/27/2000	Tinku Acharya	INTL-0493-US (P10273)	5885

7590 06/30/2004

Timothy N. Trop
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 KATY FWY, STE. 100
HOUSTON, TX 77024-1805

EXAMINER	
DASTOURI, MEHRDAD	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2623	

DATE MAILED: 06/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Application Number: 09/722,982
Filing Date: November 27, 2000
Appellants: ACHARYA ET AL.

Timothy N. Trop
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 KATY FWY, STE. 100
HOUSTON, TX 77024-1805

Sanjeev K. Singh
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed April 9, 2004.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The brief does not contain a statement identifying the related appeals and interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief. Therefore, it is presumed that there are none. The Board, however, may exercise its discretion to require an explicit statement as to the existence of any related appeals and interferences.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Invention

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Issues

The appellant's statement of the issues in the brief is correct.

(7) Grouping of Claims

Appellant's brief includes a statement that claims 1-16 do not stand or fall together and provides reasons as set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) and (c)(8).

(8) Claims Appealed

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(9) Prior Art of Record

DiZenzo et al. "Run-Based Algorithm for Binary Image Analysis and Processing" IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence, Vol. 18, No. 1 (January 1996), pp. 83-89

(10) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 1-3, 7, 8 and 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Di Zenzo et al (Run-Based Algorithm for Binary Image Analysis and Processing).

This rejection is set forth in prior Office Action, Paper No. 6.

(11) Response to Argument

Appellants' arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Appellants argue in essence that prior arts of record (Di Zenzo et al.) do not represent the binary image in a pixel matrix. Appellants further argue that the binary image is represented by the graph shown in Figure 1 which do not meet any recognizable conception of a matrix.

It is respectfully submitted that a binary image (which is a subset of digital image) is inherently represented by a matrix of rows and columns wherein each element of the matrix is a pixel that can be addressed individually for processing by a digital computer.

Di Zenzo et al.'s invention clearly represent the binary image in a pixel matrix as described in Section 1, Paragraph 3, indicating that a binary image is completely specified by a linked list of its runs or run representation which includes matrices of 1xm

rectangles of binary image pixels. A vertical pixel matrix in Di Zenzo et al.'s invention is represented by three integers x, y, z, where x is the column number, while y and z are the row numbers of the first, and, respectively, the last pixels of the matrix. This applies analogously to a horizontal row matrix.

It is further submitted that Figure 1 is comprised of Figures 1(a) and 1(b). Figure 1(a) undoubtedly represents pixel matrices of the binary image as explained in Page 85, first Paragraph of Column 1. Figure 1(b) depicts the corresponding graph of the pixel matrices.

Appellants' further arguments concerning Claims 2 and 7 issues are moot since Di Zenzo et al disclose a representation of the binary image in a pixel matrix.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Mehrdad Dastouri
June 24, 2004
Mehrdad Dastouri

Conferees

Amelia Au

Jon Chang